

BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION

P.O. Box 944246
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460
(916) 653-8007
(916) 653-0989 FAX
Website: www.bof.fire.ca.gov



MINUTES BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION January 5 and 6, 2005 Sacramento, California

BOARD OF FORESTRY MEMBERS PRESENT:

Stan Dixon, Chairman
Kirk Marckwald, Vice Chairman
Mark Bosetti
Susan Britting
David Nawi
Tharon O'Dell
Gary Ryneearson
Nancy Drinkard

BOARD STAFF:

George Gentry, Executive Officer
Eric Huff, Executive Officer, Foresters Licensing
Chris Zimny, Regulations Coordinator
Mark Hite, Committee Staff
Laura Estrada, Executive Assistant

DEPARTMENTAL STAFF:

Dennis Hall, Chief, THP Administration,
Forestry and Fire Protection
Duane Shintaku, Assistant Deputy Director, Forest Practice,
Forestry and Fire Protection
Bill Stewart, Chief FRAP, Forestry and Fire Protection

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Dixon called the January 2005 meeting to order.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. George Gentry, Executive Officer, announced that he had no actions to report.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Dixon asked the Board to consider approval of the November and December 2004 minutes.

04-6-3 Mr. Nawi and Mr. O'Dell indicated that there were some minor editorial corrections. Mr. O'Dell moved to approve the November and December 2004 minutes as amended. Mr. Ryneearson seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Chairman Dixon asked the Board for the approval of the Consent Calendar per Mr. Eric Huff.

04-6-4 Mr. Rynearson made a motion to approve the action proposed on the consent calendar. Ms. Britting seconded the motion, and all were in favor.

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN

Chairman Dixon went over the Governor's speech indicating his recommendations on the abolishment of Boards and Commissions, one of which is the Board of Forestry. The Chairman said that he would keep the Board informed on any updates or changes. This process still needs to go through legislation and the Little Hoover Commission.

Chairman Dixon went over the meeting he and Mr. Gentry had with Assemblyman LaMalfa regarding the Board's proposed Permanent Rule relevant to Fuel Hazard Reduction and how that might coincide with Assemblyman LaMalfa's Legislation. Chairman Dixon indicated that it was a productive meeting and as a result of that was going to be addressing the Board this morning regarding the Permanent Rule.

BOARDS GOALS AND OBJECTIVES FOR 2005

Mr. George Gentry, Executive Officer for the Board, distributed copies of the Board and the Committee's General Goals and Objectives. He said if there were any items that need changes or areas of discussion to please advise.

Mr. Gentry asked the Regulations Coordinator to give a brief overview of the Regulatory Schedule.

Mr. Chris Zimny, Regulations Coordinator, explained that the Board has several regulations that have been previously prepared for adoption. These Regulations will need to be filed by June 2005. The primary regulation that has some time certainty is the Permanent Fuel Hazard Rule, and the Transition Silverculture Rule, which was originally noticed in April 04. Mr. Zimny also discussed the Road Management Plan and AB2420 Forest Fire Protection rules

Mr. Gentry also went over another issue that was not included in the list, but asked the Board to consider. He categorized these as education and communication. He said that in reference to education, the Board does have a mandate to review education and research relating to the field of Forestry. In communication, the Board needs to do a better job in communicating its actions to the public. Some ideas are developing a better Internet website for the summation of information and also doing better outreach. Also, possibly creating AD HOC Committees in assisting the Board in both tasks. Mr. Gentry made it clear that those two aspects are two areas that the Board needs to strongly consider. Many of the items listed were also in last year's list. Some of those on the list are such big items that will continually need to be evolved.

Chairman Dixon reported that the Board is faced with potentially being abolished effective July 1, 2005. Between now and that date, the Board will continue to do business as usual. One alternative would be to adopt what the Board has at this time with the idea of coming back August 1st and recalculating what the Boards goals and objectives were in the event that the Board is still here.

Mr. Nawi asked if it was appropriate for the Board to take any action regarding the Board's abolishment.

Mr. Reeves, Deputy Attorney General Counsel for the Board, responded by saying that he does not know of anything that would prevent the Board from making any statements of policy resolution on its own. He indicated that it's a political matter.

Chairman Dixon said that the Board needs to do business as usual with the vision that is in front of all Board members.

Mr. Nawi asked Mr. Gentry that while following the process that will be happening in the Little Hoover Commission, if he could bring facts against abolishing the Board. He said that the Board brings a valuable cross section of industry on the Board members and the fact that they meet in public and make decisions in public and bring up whole issues on the actions that it takes. Mr. Nawi asked if it is possible to present these facts to the Little Hoover Commission by letter of testimony from the Executive Officer.

Chairman Dixon asked if Mr. Nawi would formalize that action in the event that the Executive Officer and the Chairman have to take some sort of position or provide some reference to the Little Hoover Commission.

Mr. Nawi said he would be glad to put that in some form of a motion.

04-8-7 Mr. Nawi made a motion for the Executive Officer, that he be directed to pay very close attention to the process and to keep Board members abreast of any news affecting the Board's existence in the Little Hoover Commission. Additionally, it would be the Executive Officer and the Chair's responsibility to support the continuing existence of the Board and in a timely fashion and keep other members of the Board informed regarding the process. Ms. Britting seconded the motion. All Board members were in favor and the motion was carried unanimously.

Chairman Dixon asked Board members if there were any questions regarding priorities of the Board.

Ms. Britting asked about the priorities that were listed for the Forest Practice Committee. She said in reviewing the items that were listed many of the issues are not necessarily rules, but are in the phase of monitoring or were in processes that were close to resolution. She indicated that the one exception is the Stewardship NTMP. Ms. Britting recalled that the Committee had agreed on taking certain action and to begin working on that item. She's aware that it is a huge concept that is going to take a fair amount of staff work. She indicated that the Board had strong support from small landowners and agencies to pursue this.

Chairman Dixon said that in 30 days the Board might have a better grasp on how to proceed.

Mr. Nawi made a suggestion of adding the word "in coordination", to the very first item on the first page. He also had a question on the order listing one through seven on the Policy Management Priorities.

Mr. Ryneanson had a question regarding the Ad Hoc priorities. He said there are three levels of priorities. In the last category (low), they are in that position not because they are low priority, but a monitored report. Mr. Ryneanson asked Mr. Gentry to change from low priority of this item to "Monitor and Coordinate".

Mr. Gentry said that he would change the last item to "monitor and coordinate".

Ms. Britting had a question on one of the items on Policy and Management. The FRAP policy statement could be a very positive thing and worthy of completing if possible before July.

Mr. O'Dell said that the FRAP Policy Statement is very high on their listing as well. They have had one public meeting in Redding and one is scheduled for February and another one is in its early planning stages set for the May Board meeting.

Mr. Nawi asked if this item would be finished before the June meeting.

Mr. O'Dell responded by saying that if the process moves forward this particular item should take a high immediacy. Member O'Dell said if the Board may be abolished by July 1, 2005, the item needs to be finished.

Chairman Dixon asked member Bosetti if he had any comments on the Resource Protection Committee recommendations.

Mr. Bosetti said that the first four recommendations have already been started and are on various phases. They have not begun working on the Forest Fire Policy Review as of yet. The nursery review issue is ongoing. The last two items they have not begun working on at this time.

Chairman Dixon asked if the Board would like to consider member Britting's suggestion on holding off on the suggested adoption of the goals for 2005. This is with the idea that the Board may have a clearer picture of where they are at in February or adopt these recommendations now and if at a later time make amendments.

04-08-7-Mr. O'Dell's moved to adopt the recommendations for 2005 with them being subject to change. Member Britting seconded the motion. All Board members were in favor and the motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Peter Rebar, urged the Board to get the recommendations out on a website for others to be able to access.

PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS REGARDING THE FIRE AND RESOURCE ASSESSMENT PROGRAM POLICY STATEMENT PER PRC 4789

Mr. Eric Huff, Executive Officer, Foresters Licensing, announced that there is a tentative scheduled hearing in San Bernardino on February 23, 2005. A mailer will go out on the details of this hearing.

Mr. Rynearson asked if this was the only hearing that has been scheduled.

Mr. Eric Huff said that there possibly may be another meeting in Sacramento possibly prior to May, but that will be discussed in the Policy and Management Committee.

Mr. Nawi said that if there will be hearings in Sacramento they should be scheduled soon.

Mr. Bill Stewart, Fire Resource Assessment Program, (FRAP), had a clarification to make regarding the FRAP Policy Statement. The FRAP Policy Statement is not the Department's policy statement. Bill Stewart indicated that they just wrote the assessment.

Chairman Dixon said there was an item that came up in the Resource Protection Committee Yesterday. The U.S. Forest Service allocation to region five for 2005 Hazardous Fuels Reduction Budget has been proposed to be cut by nine million dollars. The Committee was asked if they felt comfortable recommending that the full Board write a letter to Mike Rey, the Secretary in Agriculture, requesting that they reconsider this issue. Mr. Gentry will make copies for Board members to consider.

Chairman Dixon asked Board members not to pursue adoption of the Fuel Hazard Rule today because the Board has not had an opportunity to meet with Senator Kuehl. Assemblyman LaMalfa will be coming to address the board regarding this rule. Mr. Dixon noted that, per the Regulations Coordinator, the Board does have options. The Board could possibly put this in February's meeting timeframe. With the proposed abolishment of the Board, the Board may want to consider a final one hundred and twenty day extension of temporary rules.

FUEL HAZARD REDUCTION, 2004 - HEARING

Mr. Zimny gave a brief overview of the hearing. He said that this was a continuation of a 45-day notice of a public hearing for adoption of a permanent Fuel Hazard Reduction Regulation that was noticed by the Board in November.

The initial hearing, 45 day notice for permanent adoption, was extended to today's date. Currently this rule was adopted on an emergency basis. In June and October the emergency was extended. Currently, the rule is effective until approximately February 24, 2005. If a permanent rule is adopted, the emergency regulation will remain in effect for 2005 and a permanent rule will become effective in 2006. This is a regulation that adds a new emergency condition to the Forest Practices Act for the purpose of fuel hazard reduction. The regulation provides specific locations and performance measures to be achieved for fuel hazard reduction. The goal of the regulation was the reduction of surface fuels, ladder fuels and commercial canopy fuels around communities at risk as well as areas that are near public roads, houses, fuel breaks and other infrastructure.

Chairman Dixon introduced and thanked Assemblyman LaMalfa for meeting with him and the Executive Officer.

Assemblyman Doug LaMalfa, representing the Second Assembly District of the State, announced that he was pleased to have the opportunity to comment on what he felt was a very important item the Board has under consideration. It is his view that the Board should continue the use of the Emergency Notice promulgated for Fuel Hazard Reduction until a permanent rule is adopted. In the Second Assembly District, as well as most of the other forested regions throughout the State, fuel conditions have greatly increased in the recent years and this was recently documented in the U.S. Forest Service inventory in an analysis which concluded that millions of acres of forest land in the State that are at great risk of a wild fire.

Assemblyman LaMalfa went over AB 2420. He believes that AB 2420 is complimentary to the Boards Regulation of the Emergency Notice and never intended the Bill to override or preempt the Boards action. AB 2420 amends Section 4584 of the Public Resources Code. The Boards Fuel Treatment Regulation addressed Section 4592. He said they are consistent in that they are both targeted to expire at the end of 2007. He said that hopefully by that time much progress will be made towards solving the problem of excessive fuel loads in the Wildland Urban Interface, as well as across the broader forested landscape. He agreed that there is good justification in keeping both instruments in place. The bill encompasses a much broader area for fuel treatment than what is authorized under the emergency rule. Given this larger acreage, 2420 is much more limited than the Boards rule, in regards to maximum tree diameter that was harvested, which is eighteen inch stump diameter and twenty four inches within five-hundred feet of a structure or in a shaded fuel break within a community of a wildfire protection plan approved by a public fire agency; whereas the Emergency Notice Rules are targeted much more to communities at risk within the wildland urban interface.

Assemblyman LaMalfa said that he is satisfied with both the Bill and the Boards Fuel Reduction Hazard Regulations, which provide the necessary environmental protections, which ensure that abuse does not occur and these measures result in overall improvements in environmental quality. He believes that the situation should be monitored very carefully and additional amendments should be considered in the future if the current provisions are inadequate to achieve the desired results. He encouraged the Board to adopt the proposed rule regarding Fuel Hazard Reduction.

Mr. Nawi asked in prior consideration with this matter, that the Board has heard concerns that the differences in Legislation and Regulations have a financial effect on the timber operators. Under the limits of the Legislation, that economically it would not even be profitable or break even for some operators. Member Nawi asked to what extent did those economic considerations factor into the Legislation.

Assemblyman LaMalfa said that they worked with people from all sides on the issue to come up with legislation that everybody would be comfortable with. The regulations that they came up with were such that they could have concurrence with people from the industry as well as environmental folks that would be implementable and make progress towards fuel reduction. He said this is somewhat of a pilot project in a sense, where they will be looking at this in the next few years. If they are not seeing the utilization of this regulation, they will come back and talk about what will work. In addition, he said there are not enough State dollars or grant dollars to be doing this on a regular basis if it does not generate with positive economic impact.

Mr. Chris Zimny reviewed the consistency of the Emergency Regulation and potential current regulation with other Legislation. He explained that the third item was to do a monitoring field review of the existing emergency notices that had been filed with the Department and that report will be given today. In addition, colleagues from the field will also be giving their prospective and answer questions. Mr. Zimny referred the Board members to full report handouts on the findings from the field monitoring and a Power Point Presentation, which he will be referring to in the presentation. Dr. Bill Stewart, FRAP, also had a handout discussing the cooperative PNW Station analysis that was done on this topic.

Mr. Zimny presented his background report on this emergency regulation. Mr. Zimny noted that Chairman Dixon had requested that a field review and summary of the activities be done to assist the Board members in the decision making process. During the November instruction for this review, Chairman Dixon focused on several questions. Generally, the questions that Mr. Zimny was trying to answer in the field review were related to the extent of use of this regulation, how well did the implemented plan meet the intended goals, and if it was appropriately used. Additionally, what were the size of the trees being removed, what were some of the economics of the project and in general, was the project really useful to the land owner. Mr. Zimny went over the Power Point Presentation.

Mr. Nawi asked the Regulations Coordinator that if this regulation remains in effect on a permanent basis, how many projects might be seen in the future in the next year or two beyond the twenty two projects that are on file.

Mr. Zimny responded by saying he was not certain of the number, but likely there will be more and increasing amounts over time. He felt that the two things that would improve the trend were making the rule permanent to provide some continuity and having the regulation in place early in the season so people can plan their operations.

Mr. Nawi asked about the percentage of profitability and if Mr. Zimny found a correlation between those projects that removed larger trees between twenty-four and thirty inches.

Mr. Zimny said that he did not look at the project by cost. He said that he knew which projects were profitable and knew about the data on the larger trees.

Mr. Marckwald asked Mr. Zimny if the chart had frequency of projects by size harvested. He also said that you could potentially show it as a stacked graph and show profitable non-profitable break even in one graph.

Mr. Zimny agreed and said that it is one indicator of profitability.

Ms. Phyllis Banducci, Unit Forester, Amador El Dorado Unit, went over the profitability and stated that you need to think of how many projects did not get done because many were not feasible and issues of timing. In addition, she said there are a lot fewer LTO's working in the area.

Ms. Britting asked Ms. Banducci about using twenty-six inches DBH as a guide for a proxy and then she said it was mentioned that some felt it was a criteria that was not feasible. Ms. Britting asked if she meant economically feasible.

Ms. Banducci said if they were allowed to go to thirty inches DBH, those extra few inches could make a difference.

Ms. Britting asked for a clarification on stump height vs. diameter at breast height and what was the practical way of determining the size of tree.

Ms. Banducci said that the Foresters use twenty-six inches at DBH and that gives them generally thirty inches at the stump. She was not sure whether they use inside or outside stump.

Ms. Britting said that the discussion was mostly focused around diameter breast height.

Gary Rynearson asked Ms. Banducci if contractors have approached her as to what the future is for this regulation.

Ms. Banducci said that yes she has been approached and folks are just waiting to see what happens.

Mr. Rynearson asked if this Board were to move to a permanent rule, would there be a higher level of interest with contractors.

Ms. Banducci responded by saying yes.

Mr. Rynearson asked if she saw coordination, especially with the small landowners, where LTO's can coordinate multiple landowners and put them under multiple permits to help the economy scale.

Ms. Banducci said yes.

Mr. Rynearson asked what they were doing with the non-utilizable materials.

Ms. Banducci said they have used chipping and burning.

Mr. Rynearson asked if in her area there was a fuel market for the material.

Ms. Banducci said there is nothing in the Amador and El Dorado County.

Mr. Bosetti asked about the criteria on tree selection and diameter that is used in the industry.

Ms. Banducci said that outside bark diameter is used because it is consistent.

Ms. Britting asked about project proponents using one hundred and fifty foot exemption for fire clearance in combination with the emergency condition that would improve their profitability within an area near permanent structure.

Ms. Banducci said that she discourages people from doing that because of enforcement, it is impossible to be able to differentiate between the two.

Mr. Rynearson said he had a question regarding the 1038 dead and dying exemption.

Ms. Banducci said that it has only occurred one time.

Mr. Nawi asked if Ms. Banducci had received any communication or questions regarding the process outlined in the LaMalfa Legislation.

Ms. Banducci responded no.

Mr. Zimny said that Dr. Bill Stewart, FRAP, would be doing a separate analysis that was done regarding fire hazard needs that were done relative to diameter.

Dr. Bill Stewart, Fire and Resource Assessment Program, FRAP, reported that when some of the different rules came up he looked at the tools that were out there because there had been a lot of questions over how many trees were out there, what were the sites like and how much was it going to cost. He said that the U.S. Forest Service had done some computer modeling over similar issues looking at if you could actually fund fuel reductions using smaller diameter trees. They had done a lot of computer runs and cost models on harvesting removing ladder fuels and transporting them to distant places. He went over a study titled BioSum that the U.S. Forest Service did in Southern Oregon and Northern California, where they had all the Federal plots in forest service land as well as private plots. Mr. Stewart asked the Forest Service to re-do that analysis and take out about one hundred plots in Northern California on private lands. In addition, he said that he took the private plots in California from Lassen and Trinity County North, which are about three hundred plots. They ran different scenarios, which are similar to the Board Rules.

They were all thinning from below and taking the taller species first and leaving the intolerant species in the hardwood. As soon as they reached the fuel reduction goal they stopped harvesting. They did find in the analysis that reducing the torching index was always more expensive because it requires taking out a lot smaller trees that are basically slash or low-grade biomass.

Mr. Stewart went over the diagram that was distributed to the Board members. He said that the key element is when you change the diameter limit and if you can do larger projects it is not what the post treatment project will look like, but how many acres are going to be treated. When you get too low on the diameter limit, it is very hard to imagine how anyone could break even, given the very high cost of slash removal and trucking the material.

Mr. Bosetti asked what type of surface fuel treatments and sub-merchantable material were the loggers applying and what kind of cost were they dealing with.

Mr. Stewart said they had people from PNW go out there and do the chipping and removing and would take the material where they could sell it.

Mr. Rynearson asked if they were able to identify the acres that were treatable.

Mr. Stewart said the model they used was two thousand feet of a road and less than forty percent slope.

Mr. Nawi asked that in Mr. Zimny's presentation he had a smaller sampling that Mr. Stewart's represented and he understood that Mr. Zimny's result was that there was a total of seventy-one percent that would be break even or profitable under the regulations. In addition, he said that Mr. Stewart's graph shows that there was no DBH limit at all and it would be a total sum of over fifty percent that would generate a profit. He asked if he could correlate those two factors. He felt there is a disconnection.

Mr. Stewart said the disconnection is the self-selection. Everybody that started the project thought that they were going to break even, so twenty-nine percent of the people were wrong. It is a sampling.

There was further discussion.

Mr. Dennis Hall, Chief, THP Administration, Forestry and Fire Protection, Briefly wanted to let the Board know they submitted a letter of support for the adoption of the permanent rule. The Department has received 140 emergencies, which twenty-two were seen as true fire safe emergencies. Last year there were ninety-six true emergencies. Because they required an RPF to declare a bonafide emergency existed, they were not likely going to be used in place of a one hundred and fifty foot fire safe clearance. They probably would be confined to true emergency situations, which is probably what has been seen from the photos and the work that has been done so far and has been working. The faster the Board acts on this the less uncertainty the landowners will have that this is a viable tool for them to consider for treating the fuels around their homes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Frank Stewart, Director, Sierra Nevada Region, thanked the Board for addressing this issue and felt that this is a needed rule. The emergency exemption is to address the hazardous fuel conditions that are threatening the communities and watersheds at risk. He encouraged the Board to reauthorize the bill, but wanted to give some suggestions. He asked that the geographical locations be expanded to wildland interface areas as designated and approved County fire plan or community wildfire protection plan. At this, time it is limited to a quarter mile. Plumas County Plan is in the final stages of review through the Board of Supervisors in Plumas County and the WUI around the community is one and a half miles. The other issue is the thirty-inch diameter rule. Mr. Stuart said that he thought it should be DBH as a rule. He said if you change it to meters it creates confusion and said that is why DBH is a good standard for forestry. He encouraged the Board to go beyond thirty inches in dead, dying or diseased to achieve that critical canopy reduction.

He said that he would hope that the rule would allow a full one hundred and twenty days of operation for the contractors to do these jobs. He encouraged the Board to consider these amendments.

Mr. Paul Mason, Sierra Club, asked about a letter that was sent to the Executive Officer on comments that he sent by email. The letter had comments on the proposed rule which has an enormous and loosely defined footprint. He reported that they are talking about a footprint of roughly 17% of the private forested landscape. He went on to say that on that landscape they are talking about doing significant habitat modification. It is intended to change fire behavior and will change the quality and nature of the habitat. The canopy closure will be reduced to about forty percent, whereas owl foraging habitats are at about sixty percent. He is concerned that the documentation that has come along with this rule has not adequately assessed the cumulative impacts if applying those types of modifications to potentially three millions acres in California. He said that as the Board is looking at this rule, this is what the Board should be reviewing. If the rule would be implemented what would be the full impact. In addition, Mr. Mason went over the twenty-one inch diameter.

Mr. Kevin Collins, Santa Cruz County, Lompico Watershed Conservancy, said that he felt that the thirty-inch diameter was too excessive for fuel reduction. In addition, clarification needs to be made on inside diameter. He said there is a potential for abuse and is too broad. It is an exception for fire reduction not an alternative to THP processing. He felt that the profitability issue is secondary and whether the slash is really going to be treated effectively is going to be a big problem on whether or not those exceptions actually result in a reduction of fire and not an increase.

Mr. Richard Geinger asked the Board to delay action on this proposed rule for a month. There is much attention going into monitoring the regulations. He thought it would be a good idea to formally include it into the rules package. He felt that there needs to be a clarification on diameter measurements and what they mean.

Mr. Geinger asked the Board not to vote on this package today and make the changes that have been suggested. He said that he does support Paul Mason's comments about cumulative watershed effects and its impacts. He encouraged Board members to change the package to 2007 instead of 2006, based on the reality that it will probably take time to make a package that is adequate and combines legislative and administrative approaches.

Mr. Dan Weldon, Forest Landowners of California, thanked the Regulations Coordinator for the excellent presentation. He said the Board needs to give more education on these programs. It may need some changes to give more utility to small forest landowners. Mr. Weldon believes that the Board has an opportunity to make substantial changes to the landscape if they can give landowners incentives to do thinning on their land and at the same time would help the fire situation if this were done. He encouraged the Board to make the rule permanent, but removal is a big cost and can be a tremendous burden to small landowners. Mr. Weldon said he would like to see the rule made permanent.

Mr. Bill Key, representing California License Forester's Association (CLFA), commented that this issue has been blown out of proportion. He said that he was not sure if Senator Kuhel was privy to more than one point of view, before signing a letter to the the Board, which accused the Board of overstepping their authorities. He said that he appreciated Assemblyman LaMalfa's clarifying comments he made. The fuels issue is a huge environmental and public safety issue that needs all the policy attention that government can bring to bear. The Board has its own authorities granted by statute. The Board, as intended by legislature has the benefit of a much more deliberative process than legislature. He said that he feels the Board has proven its fuel hazard emergency treatment template after hours of public deliberation. He said that much more good than bad is being done on these ongoing projects. He felt that Ms. Banducci's testimony about landowners, foresters and timber operators gearing up for the expected increase in fuel projects this season, also supports the contention that for the Board not to supply rule continuity at this point would be a huge step backwards.

Mr. Jim Ostrowski, General Manager, Timber Products Company, based in Yreka, supports the rule and feels issues have been debated for many years and the need is clearly existent. He felt that the Board is acting appropriately since there are huge implications of fuel loading problems that exist in Siskou County. The economy is dependent on wood products, but also some other values need to be addressed. The rule that the Board passed last year needs time to be implemented. He felt that by delaying, a message is being sent out that there is some hesitation. He feels that the limited areas that are profitable just show that how many areas will not be able to be treated. The Board needs to move ahead and get rid of some of the regulatory costs.

Mr. John Hoffman, Director of Natural Resources for the Regional Counsel of Rural Counties, supports the continuation of the emergency notice for fuel hazard reduction. He feels that there is a sufficient difference between LaMalfa's Bill and the emergency notice that warrants the adoption of both. The focus of the emergency notice is on high and extreme fuel hazard areas near identified communities. The target of LaMalfa's Bill is the general forest. The treatment limitations are slightly different, but justifiably different. LaMalfa's Bill has a limitation of three hundred acres, but the one hundred and twenty day limitation of the emergency rule limits the practicality far less than 300 acres as demonstrated by the Regulations Coordinator. He suggested a few changes to the emergency notice. First, they would consider expanding it to the communities at risk to include at risk communities as defined in the Healthy Forest Legislation. He went over the differences. Secondly, he asked the Board to consider the diameter limits as has been discussed. The thirty inch DBH is applicable on Forest Service Lands. He said it would be nice to apply a similar prescription across the landscapes so effective fuel breaks can be made. Lastly, he said a marginally treated land today is inadequate next year. Mr. Hoffman, distributed copies of his summary.

Mr. Glenn Gottschall, Forestry consultant, said that the emergency regulation needs to become a permanent rule. In addition, permanent approval of this rule will encourage more fuel treatment in the "Communities at Risk" and areas with the most critical need for fire protection and will begin to provide the needed incentive for rebuilding the timber industry which is an important factor in managing fire prone forest. He also said that LaMalfa, AB2420, has provided some help and facilitates thinning on up to three hundred acres per plan by allowing removal of trees up to eighteen inch stump diameter, but does not allow a landowner to use the value of the larger trees to offset the cost of removing the smaller trees and other hazardous fuels. This unfortunately limits this treatment to those landowners who have the financial means to cover the expense, which can run from five hundred to five thousand per acre. A timber Harvest Plan is the only other approval method on private land to remove larger trees and often is expensive, complex and time consuming.

Mr. Gottschall said that permanent approval of this rule will encourage more fuel treatment in the "Communities at Risk" and areas with the most critical need for fire protection and will begin to provide the needed incentive for rebuilding the timber industry which is an important factor in managing fire prone forests.

Mr. Michael Mitchell, School Teacher, Clovis Unified School District, encouraged the Board to move forward with the Legislation and make the changes permanent. His school district was a recent recipient of twenty-seven acres from the Stanislaus Natural Forest. Essentially, Clovis Unified School District is a private landowner. He urged the Board to move forward with the permanent rule, so he would be able to have the latitude to go through and do thinning and fuel reduction on his site. Mr. Mitchell also encouraged the Board to consider increasing the diameter of the harvest limit because although he is not looking for a profit he does want to save his site from any catastrophic fire in the future, so he could continue to offer education for fourteen thousand students a year.

Mr. Michael Albrecht, President, Sierra Resource Management, reported that the Board has made an excellent case that California's forests need thinning. LaMalfa's AB2420 attempts to address this need. Unfortunately, it falls short because of its limitations on acreage and tree diameter. The thirty-inch stump diameter closely mimics the maximum thirty-inch DBH rules that the Forest Service employed during the CASPO guidelines. The cost of mechanical harvesting operations cannot be sustained when limited to eighteen inch cutting guidelines. In addition, he said that neither AB2420 nor 1052.4 would save all our forest, communities or firefighters. They signal an acknowledgement that something needs to change. He felt that the Board does not need to make the rules perfect to make them permanent. He encouraged the Board to make the Emergency Notice for Fuel Hazard Reduction a permanent tool that forestry professionals can use to thin California's forests.

Chairman Dixon stated that he had made a commitment to meet with Senator Kuehl regarding this rule and asked Board members not to bring this forward to a vote today. The Regulations Coordinator had explained to the Committee and the Board that there are options on actions that can be done in February regarding this permanent rule package. The Chairman explained that this would give the Board ample opportunity to determine what may be our future relative to hearings with the Little Hoover Commission. Chairman Dixon said that if he had any reservations on this matter to deal with this permanent rule package or at least an extension, he would support the adoption of this rule today, but as Chairman of the Board, he made a commitment to meet with Senator Kuehl regarding this issue.

Mr. Nawi addressed his questions to the Regulations Coordinator. For the twenty nine percent of the people who availed themselves on the emergency regulation and lost money and did not break even, is there any way to find out if they anticipated that loss or even if they did not anticipate it, would they nevertheless have proceeded based on the fire protection that they received.

Mr. Zimny responded by saying that they did not ask that question specifically, although they did ask about general profitability and general comments. In the request for general commentary, the Regulations Coordinator did receive at least one response from a general landowner that said the loss or investment that he made was a worthwhile insurance policy for fire hazard reduction.

Mr. Nawi also asked the Regulations Coordinator about cumulative impacts analysis, which he said was lacking from the report. He said there is no heading or section addressing cumulative impacts and he thinks potential impact of this regulation should be addressed. Additionally, if there is anything that can be done to address that issue, it would be highly beneficial.

Vice Chair Marckwald asked the Regulations Coordinator until what date did the current emergency run.

Mr. Zimny responded by saying it expires on February twenty fourth.

There was further discussion.

Vice Chair Marckwald asked about the diameter limits. He said that one standard should fit all. He said that perhaps the Department could make a suggestion on this issue.

Mr. Ryneason said that the stump diameter was discussed in depth in the Forest Practice Committee. The Committee selected the thirty-inch inside bark DBH because of operations that usually occur in the early spring when the sap turns hard and mechanical harvesters are being used, the bark is going to be knocked off those stumps after they have been severed. Looking at this from a standpoint of administration of the regulation by CDF, trying to reconstruct what the outside bark diameter was and the DBH was prior to the tree being severed becomes very difficult. For those reasons, the Committee chose inside diameter.

Mr. Bosetti asked the Chairman what the Board's standard is. Tree selection is outside diameter DBH and you cannot measure DBH after the operation. He felt that this is a point of discussion that needs to be discussed in this meeting. If the Board is going to change a standard and postpone the decision on all the other elements of this project till February, we are not going to have time and will be out of the scope on what we can do within our regulation and process.

Chairman Dixon asked the Regulations Coordinator about another emergency extension.

Mr. Chris Zimny responded by saying the final rule packages need to be filed with OAL during the period of emergency. The determination of this emergency is February twenty fourth in this case for them to consider and approve on an individual basis. The extension of the Board's rule for emergency conditions throughout 2005 is January 1, 2006. Mr. Zimny has contacted OAL and has asked them given the Board's situation on needing to deliberate based on more information, and the continuation of the hazard out there is it reasonable to request an extension that would move the Board beyond the February date.

There response was you can submit the request, but the request has to be accompanied with the reason why the permanent rule is not adopted and a description of the need based on continuing the emergency. Mr. Zimny indicated that OAL would not commit one-way or the other.

Mr. Zimny also indicated that if the Board needs to initiate further revisions to the regulation, supporting data to do a cumulative effect analysis will be a significant investment in time.

Ms. Britting had a question regarding the diameter limit. She agreed with member Bosetti on the issue of how to mark the tree or do the enforcement. She felt that a decision needs to be made regarding this issue. She was surprised to hear that the Department agreed that outside at stump height would be something that they would use. She felt that it was in somewhat conflict with some of the discussions that the Committee had promoted on inside stump height diameter. She also indicated the point of identifying the height above ground at which the stump diameter needs to be taken is also a relevant point.

There was further discussion.

Mr. Nawi asked the Regulations Coordinator if it is an option to extend for a second or third one hundred and twenty days with OAL. Mr. Nawi was under the impression that it can only be done once.

Mr. Zimny said yes, it could be submitted again.

Mr. Nawi asked if the Board could put out a 15-day change now and indicate potential options so the Board would not have to do one in February. That would give the Board enough choices so when February comes that would give the Board enough time for deliberation.

Mr. Zimny said that it could be done. It would give the Board enough calendar time to do a 15-day notice.

Ms. Drinkard asked if the Department had a preference.

Mr. Duane Shintaku, Assistant Deputy Director, Forest Practice, Forestry and Fire Protection, said that the Department would have no problem measuring inside bark. The Department is satisfied with thirty-inch diameter.

Mr. Nawi asked Mr. Shintaku if landowners and timber operators are comfortable with this measure.

Mr. Shintaku said that it is important to have that RPF involvement. When you have the RPF explaining the situation and the basic concepts to the landowners. He did not feel it was a difficult concept to grasp.

Mr. Ryneason proposed that the Board leave the diameter as it is in the current regulation as listed in the 45-day notice on the permanent rule. He also proposed to leave the hearing open for this matter and forward it to the February meeting. He said that he appreciated the recommended changes from the testimony, however he did not feel that the Board should attempt making any changes that would jeopardize the Board's ability to move forward and have this approved by February. He also would like to agendaize for the Board's February meeting a consideration for a third one hundred and twenty day emergency, in the event that the Board has a debate on the content of this notice for a permanent rule

Mr. Nawi asked if the Chairman will be meeting with a member of the Legislature, his hope would be that as a result of that conversation, the Board in February might have a proposal that has acceptance. At this time, member Nawi feels there is a considerable gap, particularly on the matter of size of tree that can be removed. It might be beneficial for the Chairman and another Board member, following the meeting with Senator Kuehl to see if there is a way to bring to the Board and public a proposal next month that would be a compromise and acceptable to all. Putting options out would allow that to occur and would give the maximum flexibility. This could be put out as an option, where it would give the Board that latitude without the necessity of a third extension or a thirty day notice.

His suggestion is for Chairman Dixon and another Board member be empowered to see if a resolution can be brought back to the Board in February and meanwhile there can be a fifteen day notice which maximizes the Boards flexibility to work out a regulatory package.

Chairman Dixon said that he does not have a problem doing that, but a commitment has been made with the Senator and he has no expectations on what may come from the meeting. He does not have the intent to try to get some commitment from her. He wants her to understand the Boards public process and that we heard from people on the ground, that we adopted emergency rules, that we monitored the implementation, and that we have heard from Assemblyman LaMalfa that he supports the Boards rule. Additionally, the Chairman said that the Board would have to resolve the diameter base, as was the issue with Senator Kuehl.

This is something that will have to be resolved in February's meeting by a vote of the Board. The Chairman said if the meeting with Senator Kuehl is not going to happen expeditiously, he would be prepared in February to deal with the proposed package. The Chairman thinks the Board can convince OAL if we need an extension because the Board is attempting to work with the Legislature. The Chairman thanked the Executive Officer, Regulations Coordinator, Board staff and the Department for the monitoring projects

Chairman Dixon said that the Chairman of the Forest Practice Committee spent a great deal of time on this rule package and made recommendations to the full Board on what should be done.

Member Ryneerson recommended agendizing the second extension with the temporary rule. Ms. Britting said she thinks the Board can make a strong case on an extension to the emergency rule in February. She said she is less concerned on having a continuance. She agrees with member Ryneerson's options to leave hearing open and take in additional comments and come back in February's Board meeting.

Vice Chair Marckwald said that he would like to see that a clarification be made on the language on line 6.

There was further discussion.

Mr. Nawi said that having heard from member Britting and member Ryerson, and other members of the Board, he is prepared to support those recommendations with a motion to proceed as they were suggesting. Member Nawi said that he would suggest to an extension to bring closure to this in February and would be beneficial to the Board to let the people know what we are trying to accomplish long term. Additionally, he would also like to follow-up on the CEQA adequacy and Mr. Zimny's question.

Chairman Dixon asked the Regulations Coordinator to make himself available with counsel to review the changes that member Nawi was referencing.

Mr. Chris Zimny said that he would. Mr. Zimny mentioned that the rule file does include a scope and potential footprint and potential impacts. He said that the word (cumulative effects) may not be present, but the scope and the related effects from habitat are at least minimally described. Part of the regulation and adoption of the rule had requirements included to mitigate to a less insignificant impact He will work on consultation with the Executive Officer and counsel on the adequacy of the Boards rule on that issue.

04-8-8 Mr. Ryneerson moved to continue this hearing to February and to continue this 45-day hearing for the adoption of the permanent Fuel Hazard Emergency Reduction Rule and to also notice in the agenda for the February meeting the potential extension of the 120-day emergency. Mr. Nawi seconded the motion. All Board members were in favor and the motion was carried unanimously.

REPORT OF FEDERAL AGENCIES; INCLUDING USDA FOREST SERVICE, NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE, US FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE, AND US ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Nothing to report.

REPORT OF STATE AGENCIES: INCLUDING STATE WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD, DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME, GEOLOGIC SURVEY

Nothing to report

UPDATE ON THE CLIMATE REGISTRY

Mr. Doug Wickizer, FFPA, Environmental Protection and Regulations, announced that the Registry adopted the protocols in October 2004. The Department and Registry are moving forward in evaluating potential for demonstration projects both public and private and will be meeting on those in the next month or two.

Mr. Wickizer was hopeful that by that time they should have some firm proposals ready to move on within the next couple of months. Additionally, the Department of Energy established a Western Carbon Sequestration Partnership. Mr. Wickizer also went over phase one and two of the partnership proposals. He said that it is the Departments hope that the work that they have accomplished up to this point will be useful at the larger national scale. The Department and Registry will be able to supply leadership in that level if it occurs.

DISCUSSION REGARDING THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (DEIR) AND MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR JACKSON DEMONSTRATION STATE FOREST (JDSF)

Mr. George Gentry reported that as of today's date three more sections have been completed on the Administrative Draft and ready for the JDSF Committee. Those parts are part two, which is the Introduction, part seven point four, and part seven point eight, which is Hazardous Materials. Part four which is Agency Involvement and part six which is Alternatives are almost complete. Those sections should be available by the end of this week. Mr. Gentry said that it would be a good time for the JDSF Committee to have a meeting, possibly the week of January 17, 2005, to review those sections and possibly other sections to be available by that time. It is believed that they may have the Administrative Draft ready for full review by the end of this month.

Mr. O'Dell asked how much of this material had the Sub-Committee or Committee of this Board reviewed. Member O'Dell also asked how many sections were on the Administrative Draft.

Mr. Gentry said that he believed there were eight or nine.

Mr. O'Dell asked when the public would be able to review.

Mr. Gentry said very soon after the end of the month. Additionally, he said that it is his intent, unless otherwise advised by the Board, to take the Administrative Draft and put it on the Board's Website. If people wish to request copies, they can write the Executive Officer for that request.

Mr. O'Dell asked if it could be put on a CD.

Mr. Gentry said that they could.

Mr. Nawi said that as a Committee they have not reviewed any sections of the Administrative Draft.

There was further discussion.

RANGE MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RMAC)

Mr. Jeff Stephens, representing the Range Management Advisory Committee (RMAC), reported that RMAC met on January 4 and 5, 2005 on Vegetation Management and more specifically CDF's Vegetation Management Program here in California. They also had testimony from the US Forest Service on their Rangeland Monitoring Program and how it effects Ag Producers owning private land as well as those allotments on Federal Ground.

The Next meeting of RMAC will be a Focus group which will take place on February 24, 2005 at 9:00 a.m. in Sacramento. The full RMAC meeting will take place on April 19 and 20, 2005, in Sacramento.

Mr. Stephens asked the Chairman for consideration of nominations for three positions that are up for expiration this month. Nomination forms should have been included in the Board members binder, as well as a quick reference sheet that Mr. Stephens distributed. The following nominations for consideration are Mr. Mel Thompson, Mr. Charles Pritchard and Mr. John Michael Connor.

04-15-6 Mr. Ryneanson moved to appoint the three members to RMAC, which included Mel Thompson, Charles Pritchard and John M. Connor to RMAC.

Mr. O'Dell, seconded the motion. All Board members were in favor and the motion was carried unanimously.

MONITORING STUDY GROUP (MSG)

Mr. Pete Cafferata, Forest Hydrologist, Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, Monitoring Study Group, (MSG), gave a brief summary on the meeting that was held November 10, 2004, at the Mendocino County Museum located in Willits.

Mr. Cafferata went over key agenda item highlights. (See handout, which was included in the Board Binders).

The next MSG meeting is scheduled for February 2, 2005 at the CDF Shasta-Trinity Unit Headquarters Emergency Command Center Conference Room in Redding.

Ms. Drinkard asked when the Agency Monitoring would commence.

Mr. Cafferata said that they are trying to get a facility this summer, but is not sure.

PROFESSIONAL FORESTERS EXAMINING COMMITTEE (PFEC)

February Mr. Huff will have cases to present before the Board. He also said they have upcoming vacancies for PFEC

Mr. Ryneanson, the nominating Sub-Committee for PFEC membership, has met and discussed the options. The two current members whose terms are up are Tom Osipowich, Unit Chief, Humboldt Del Norte and Jerry Jenson, retired Forest Service. They are both current members in good standing with PFEC and have expressed interest in being re-appointed. Member Ryneanson moved in concurrence with member O'Dell to re-nominate and appoint those two members to the PFEC.

04-15-6 Mr. O'Dell moved to accept the two nominations to appoint them to the PFEC.

Mr. Ryneanson seconded the motion. All Board members were in favor and the motion was carried unanimously.

Mr. Huff wished to note the passing of Mr. Michael William Raibley, RPF No.21; 3/25/20 to 12/11/04.

Mr. Huff, presented eight new RPF candidates to the Board and asked for Board approval on the following applicants who have met the requirements for licensing as Registered Professional Foresters, having successfully completed the examination administered on October 15, 2004:

Mr. Robert G. Lewis, RPF No. 2789
Mr. Mathew Boone, RPF No. 2790
Ms. Nadia Jeanne Hamey, RPF No. 2788
Mr. Richard W. Fitzgerald, RPF No. 2791

Mr. Daniel E. Sooy, RPF No. 2793
Mr. Brent M. Barriteau, RPF. No. 2787
Mr. Len M. Nielson, RPF No. 2792
Mr. Jeremy Roland Wright, RPF No. 2794

04-15-6 Mr. O'Dell moved to approve the new RPF Appointments

Mr. Nawi, seconded the motion. All Board members were in favor and the motion was carried unanimously

REPORT OF THE SENSITIVE WATERSHED NOMINATIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE (SWNRC)

Mr. Tharon O'Dell reported that the Committee did meet on December 16, 2004. The Regional Water Board, Pacific Lumber Company and California Geologic Survey presented some materials that would augment the petition and support the review process. The Water Board was timely in the submission of these supplemental materials. CGS was not completely ready to submit their mapping early, but they did bring to the meeting the maps. Pacific Lumber Company was trying to complete some permitting materials for the Water Board. The Committee went through the supplemental material. The next meeting is scheduled for February 3, 2005 and at that time will make determination on whether the petition is complete to proceed with the review.

Chairman Dixon added that he had some recommendations based on the presentation that Mr. Mark Lovelace gave to the Board.

FOREST PRACTICE COMMITTEE (FPC)

Ms. Sue Britting, Chair of the FPC, went over three items that were discussed in Committee and continued a discussion on the Heritage Tree Petition. The focus was on what adequate disclosure entails and concerns of Professional Foresters on the cost on what someone might find as adequate disclosure and also the desire from other participants to ensure that adequate disclosure occurred. This was resolved by asking the Department to give the Committee some draft language on the guidance which will be discussed in detail in the next Committee meeting. Ms. Britting also went over the Emergency Fuel Hazard Reduction and the Stewardship NTMP and proposal that came forward from the Ad Hoc group that addressed Forest Stewardship. A concern was raised on more additional assurance that agencies need to reduce regulatory program in streamlining.

POLICY AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (PMC)

Mr. Tharon O'Dell, Chair of the PMC, went over information item dealing with the FRAP Assessment.

Member O'Dell went over an item that has been delinquent on the agenda regarding the Oak Woodland issue and gave some background information on this. This was handed off to the RMAC Committee and they had their forum in April of last year. RMAC brought to the Committee in the summer a tentative finding document that was discussed and given input and then came back to the Committee in the Autumn with a well thought out presentation of findings, narrative and fourteen recommendations. The Committee had delayed bringing it to the Board, but they are now ready to present this to the Board for consideration of endorsement. He would like to see the Board give recommendations and have the Board decide whether it would like to endorse the recommendations. The secondary part of this discussion was the Joint Policy memo on hardwoods. The Committee felt it is up to the Board Chair to make the work assignments and so this could be amended to the Policy.

If this is put on the agenda, member O'Dell would like to invite Dr. Stewart to do a presentation before the full Board on the Oak Woodland matter, so this could help the Board on a discussion regarding a resolution to this matter. Member O'Dell deferred to member Nawi for additional comments on this subject matter.

Mr. Nawi commented that when considering this matter, if the Board could include the legislation that was enacted and became effective the first of the year dealing with CEQA.

Mr. O'Dell also went over the next agenda item that was a continuation of discussion on Performance Based Rules. Mr. Bill Snyder briefed the Committee on the Nursery.

ROADS AND WATERSHED COMMITTEE

Mr. Gary Rynearson, Chair of the Committee, reported that the Committee met yesterday and went over three agenda items. They addressed the Interagency Road Rules Review Committee. This Committee includes individuals from all the agencies involved including State Water Quality, Regional Water Quality, North Coast Regional Water Quality, CLFA, and CFA. The first goal was the reorganization of the Road Rules. The first task will be to organize Road Rules and Road Maintenance and try to consolidate all of the information for those particular aspects of roads into those proper sections. The Committee will be looking at the original proposal that came from the Interagency Committee, but also at the other existing rules. They are not going to put a timeframe on this Committee. When the work is completed they will present it to the full Board. The Committee also talked about the Road Management Plan. They are hopeful that with the concurrence of the Board they will have this by the Board's February 2005 meeting. Member Rynearson said that it is the Committee's goal is to have a standalone separately approved CEQA document that can then be used for programmatic 1600's, COHO Recovery Plans, NDL's, Waivers, etc.. The Committee also had a discussion on the Watershed based application. Additionally, there has been a request the Committee look at the Cumulative Effects Analysis that the Cumulative Effects Task Force, under Dennis Hall's leadership.

RESOURCE PROTECTION COMMITTEE MEETING (RPC)

Mr. Bosetti reported that the RPC Committee met yesterday and went over an update that Tom Hoffman presented regarding the Review of the Fire Plan. He is still on selection of members to fill out the working group, but has full intention of having a review on the Fire Plan and recommendations completed by this summer. Agenda item on SRA Lands has been deferred for the next meeting. Mr. Zimny gave a presentation in the Committee on the second submission that was received under Government Code 13360 relative to the safety elements on SB1369. This was received from the city of Hillsborough.

Mr. Gentry said he contacted the city of Hillsborough and told them that they had said they had committed to sending the Board all the elements of the General Plan. It was overlooked during the holidays, and Mr. Gentry said he would forward the documents as soon as they are received.

Mr. Bosetti said the Committee had an extensive discussion on implementing SB1369.

REPORT OF THE REGULATIONS COORDINATOR

Mr. Chris Zimny, Regulations Coordinator, went over the status of the Regulation, which was included in the Board binder. He went over the LaMalfa Regulation, which the Board adopted on an emergency basis in November. It has been filed under OAL for adoption and the ten-day period for OAL emergency approval of that is January 8, 2005. It will be in place the beginning of next week. It is between January 8, 2005 and May 8, 2005 that the permanent rule file is submitted for permanent adoption of that regulation.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Mr. George Gentry, gave special commendations for Mr. Eric Huff, Mr. Chris Zimny, Mr. Mark Hite and Ms. Laura Estrada for the outstanding work that they have done over the last two months.

Mr. Nawi asked when Giny Chandler, who was appointed General Counsel for the Department of Forestry, will be working officially for the Department.

Mr. George Gentry said that he had emailed all Board members the news clip, and said that she will be assume office on February 1, 2005.

Public Forum

Mr. Richard Geinger asked about the Stewardship NTMP that was discussed in Committee yesterday. Mr. Geinger said that he endorses the existence of the Board. He felt that it is important to retain the essential interface with the public that regulates forestlands in California. In addition, he said the recommendations on the overall process of the Sensitive Watershed need to be addressed in order to get feedback. He encouraged the Chairman to contact Mr. Mark Lovelace and let him know that the Board is thinking about this issue.

Mr. Adrian Miller, California Licensed Forest Association, CLFA, distributed the second of CLFA's white papers regarding the FRAP presentation that was done a few months ago. Its focus was on Government and its sustainability in forests in California. He went over the three interactions of the three groups, which were social values, economic values and environmental values.

NEW AND UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chairman Dixon went over new business and asked Board members if they had received the letter that he had drafted to Secretary Mark Rey, US Department of Agriculture, regarding Federal Funds for California for 2005 Hazardous Fuels Budget Program. The Chairman asked if the Board members had an opportunity to read the letter. He asked if Bill Stewart would make a comment on this.

Mr. Bill Stewart, Fire Resources Assessment Program, FRAP, commented that he has heard of this reduction and they are drafting a letter about this subject matter.
Mr. Bosetti said that he supports sending this letter out.

Mr. O'Dell commented that he supports the letter, but said that the letter is modestly worded and felt that there should be stronger language.

Mr. Nawi supports sending the letter as well.

Chairman Dixon, said that with the few editorials, it is with the Boards consensus to send the letter.

Chairman Dixon also said that member Britting and member Nawi had brought to his attention some minor editorials to the minutes for November.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Dixon adjourned the January 2005 meeting of the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

ATTEST:

George D. Gentry
Executive Officer

Stan Dixon
Chairman

Copies of the attendance sheets can be obtained from the Board Office.